

Rollins College Rollins Scholarship Online

College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes

College of Arts and Sciences Minutes

3-24-2011

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, March 24, 2011

Arts & Sciences Faculty
Rollins College

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, March 24, 2011" (2011). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 21.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/21

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Approved Minutes
Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting
Thursday, March 24, 2011
12:30 – 1:45pm
Galloway Room

Members present: Joshua Almond, Anna Alon, Ilon Alon, Ben Balak, Gabriel Barreneche, Pedro Bernal, Gay Biery-Hamilton, Rick Bommelje, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Jennifer Cavanaugh, David Charles, Martha Cheng, Daniel Chong, Edward Cohen, Gloria Cook, Daniel Crozier, Denise Cummings, Mario D'Amato, Alice Davidson, Don Davison, Joan Davison, Kimberly Dennis, Susan Easton, Hoyt Edge, David Eng-Wilmot, Richard Foglesong, Julia Foster, Christopher Fuse, Lynda Glennon, Laurel Goj, Yudit Greenberg, Eileen Gregory, Mike Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Paul Harris, Karen Hater, Alicia Homrich, Gordie Howell, Richard James, Jill Jones, Laurie Joyner, Ashley Kistler, Philip Kozel, Carol Lauer, Barry Levis, Lee Lines, Julia Maskivker, Jana Mathews, Dorothy Mays, Edna McClellan, Cecilia McInnis-Bowers, Margaret McLaren, Matilde Mesavage, Jonathan Miller, Susan Montgomery, Bob Moore, Thom Moore, Ryan Musgrave Bonomo, Steve Neilson, Rachel Newcomb, David Noe, Jim Norris, Kathryn Norsworthy, Socky O'Sullivan, Thomas Ouellette, Twila Papay, Kenneth Pestka, Jennifer Queen, James Ray, Roger Ray, Paul Reich, Bob Reinauer, David Richard, Charlie Rock, Dawn Roe, Sigmund Rothschild, Scott Rubarth, Maria Ruiz, Emily Russell, Marc Sardy, Eric Schutz, Rachel Simons, John Sinclair, Joe Siry, Eric Smaw, Bob Smither, Cynthia Snyder, Steven St. John, Bruce Stephenson, Claire Strom, Kathryn Sutherland, Bill Svitavsky, Eren Tatari, Ken Taylor, Zeynep Teymuroglu, Lisa Tillmann, Larry Van Sickle, Robert Vander Poppen, Susan Walsh, Jonathan Walz, Tonia Warnecke, Debra Wellman, Yusheng Yao, Jay Yellen, Wenxian Zhang

Guest: Sharon Agee, Pat Powers

- I. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order at 12:45 PM
- II. Approval of Minutes - The minutes of the February 24, 2011 meeting of the faculty were approved.
- III. Governance Balloting – Balloting for Governance Committees, FEC, and the Internationalization Committee occurs throughout the meeting. The first ballot is for president and vice president. (See Attachment 1.) O' Sullivan moves to accept Jones through acclamation and she is accepted. Boniface is elected vice president. The faculty then elects to AAC Musgrave and Ruiz. The faculty elects to F&S B. Moore, Snyder and Siry. The faculty elects to PSC, Davison and Vander Poppen. SLC, by acclamation, is Crozier, Montgomery and Queen.
- IV. Old Business - none
- V. New Business –
 - A. Pre-Matriculation Proposal from AAC – Levis first announces the AAC action, endorsed by EC, to suspend the lab portion (N) of O or P for

students in 2013 and 2014 due to the renovation of Bush. Levis emphasizes students still must fulfill the O and P, but the N is waived. Levis then introduces the pre-matriculation proposal and explains the history of such programs and the desirability and necessity of standardization. (See Attachment 2.) Levis states the college has had a pilot with both successful and unsuccessful study programs. He explains the program is desirable because courses vest students in the college, establish positive academic attitudes and help retention. Levis notes that Explorations and International Programs designed the program to address various academic and legal issues, and study courses will be both domestic and international. Levis moves and Vander Poppen seconds the motion. B. Moore states he knows this year's China program was very successful. Rock asks about the costs of the program, and Levis responds there is no budget impact. Smaw asks who accompanies students, faculty members or staff. Levis states faculty will teach, but staff will accompany students on international programs to help with logistics. Rock inquires about the comparability of the new program to the Langfitt programs, Levis answers the new program idea initiated with the Langfitt programs, and O'Sullivan comments that program was non-credit. Siry asks about awarding credits, and Levis states the consensus is that it is essential to immediately involve first year students in academics. Lauer seeks clarification on the screening process of students, and Levis answers that is an issue but safeguards are included. Cohen asks about costs to the student, and Levis responds that is a problem as no scholarship money exists; Levis acknowledges the program is class specific. J. Cavanaugh calls the question and the faculty votes to call the question. The motion passes.

- B. Bylaw Change Regarding Faculty Evaluation from PSC – Foglesong announces the bylaws will be discussed as separate motions. Strom explains six amendments exist and impetus for the amendments came from the administration, FEC and PSC. She notes that PSC's proposed amendments tend to focus on a desirable time line for these processes. Strom continues that some changes seem more straightforward than other changes. (See Attachments 3A and 3B.) She states the first amendment deals with the reappointment section and clarifies that reappointments occur annually after the initial appointment. Strom moves the resolution and it is seconded. Lauer notes that many of the proposed changes do not come from FEC and many changes are substantive. She cautions it is desirable to engage in complete discussion of the issues and resist premature urges to call the question. Lauer also states the first proposal does bring language into conformity with practice. Siry asks for administrator clarification of the first proposed amendment. Wellman states this change conforms with practice. Joyner further explains this change is a response to departments' desire not to keep faculty members with a problem, that is faculty members wanted an option to review new faculty members after

the initial year. Edge calls the question and the faculty vote to call the question passes. The motion then passes. Strom moves to the second proposed bylaw change and states that in the section referring to promotion to associate, the PSC recommends adding the FEC because in practice the FEC currently participates. Tillmann asks about both the amendment and current language. She questions whether the language is inappropriate because it might imply that either the Dean, CEC or FEC can stop the process, when in fact only CEC can stop the process. Yellen responds the logic of the passage is such that Tillmann need not worry. Joyner clarifies that faculty members now only get promoted to associate after tenure. Gregory disagrees with Tillmann's concern and states Tillmann is assuming the recommendation is positive, but it could be negative. Brandon explains when she chaired PSC the committee was concerned about the number of assistants promoted prior to tenure. Under the old process, FEC had no voice in the promotions, and only the dean and department participated. Brandon states that is why the FEC was added to the process. Joyner concurs Brandon is correct, but believes the passage now creates confusion, and perhaps could be eliminated because faculty members receive promotion with tenure. Brandon responds that some people on FEC opposed a hard rule that tenure and promotion must go together. Some members of FEC conceived of the possibility of hiring individuals at the associate level without tenure in order to attract them to Rollins, and therefore the section was maintained. J. Davison asks whether in fact, there is a possibility of individuals becoming associate without tenure. Joyner states no. Davison continues if such promotion is impossible then the whole section should be removed. Harris moves to table to the next meeting and the faculty approves. Rock inquires about the number of times Casey awarded promotion against the advice of the department and ignored the bylaws with regard to tenure and promotion.

Strom explains the third suggested amendment refers to the PTR and whether to make it evaluative rather than developmental. Strom states PSC wants the PTR to remain developmental, and the bylaw amendment intends to make the PTR clearly developmental. Rubarth states he is concerned about this issue because he is receiving mixed messages about the PTR. He notes the dean seems to emphasize the developmental, but calling the faculty member a "candidate" and referring to a "candidate evaluation committee" seem to emphasize evaluation. Rubarth continues if the PTR is an assessment then he will make his best case possible, but if the PTR is developmental then he will also discuss areas which require attention. Rubarth suggests amending the motion to change the word assessment to development and the CEC to tenured faculty development committee. Rubarth also suggests the PTR be called the PT Plan, to deemphasize review. Strom responds a concern is that the bylaws just prior to this section discuss how CEC is formed. Levis whether the faculty is only voting on this

amendment as opposed to the remainder of the text, even though reference to PTR, assessment and evaluation occurs throughout the text. Strom raises the issue of notice for bylaw changes and whether Rubarth's amendment is possible without notice. Lauer responds there is need for notice for bylaw changes, and Rubarth's motion would constitute more than just an amendment of the PSC proposal. Rubarth then moves to return the document to PSC to rework aspects related to the PTR as consistent with the developmental aspect. The motion is seconded. Harris states he concurs with Rubarth, and the faculty needs to think of PTR as developmental not evaluation and assessment. He expresses concern about the possibility of denial of sabbatical and the elimination of tenure. Carnahan supports Harris' point and asks whether this is first step in making more difficult to receive sabbaticals. Levis comments regarding the PTR, that last year he never met with the dean or received letter from dean. Rock concurs this also was his experience. Van Sickle also concurs. Vander Poppen calls the question and his motion passes. The motion to return the bylaw change to PSC then carries.

Strom introduces the fourth bylaw change which is a clarification related to outside letters for P&T. Strom explains under the current structure some departments require outside letters, but the candidate requests the letters. Strom states PSC suggests that if a department requires outside letters then the CEC should request the letters rather than the candidate. Strom further explains that such a change would ease the time pressure for outside referees to respond. Harris asks for a clarification whether the candidate or CEC requests letters. Strom responds the change is to shift responsibility from the candidate to CEC so that there is more time to obtain letters. Harris asks whether this can happen without candidate permission, and Strom answers it depends upon departmental bylaws. J Miller asks whether this limits the department, and Strom answers no. Papay notes there is no proviso that the candidate is able to see or respond to letters. Papay suggests the candidate should have the possibility of response. Gregory agrees the candidate must be able to see everything in the portfolio, but questions what happens if letters articulate different positions on a candidate. Gregory states she believes letters should go to the CEC, but the candidate must see the letters. Rock asks why this must be specified. Strom responds FEC does not necessarily look at other material (such as material from the CEC beyond its letter) so it is important to be in the candidate's packet. O'Sullivan suggests this is a department's responsibility if the department requires letters. Papay reiterates the importance of a candidate having time to see, reflect upon and respond to the letters. Tillmann suggests that in small departments the candidate will know best the people to contact for letters. McLaren suggests if PSC is concerned about deadlines, but there is no consistency about letters among departments, then departments which require letters should be responsible for submitting letters prior to the deadline.

McLaren proposes an amendment “if a department requires outside letters for T&P, the letters should be collected consistent with the department’s T&P guidelines and subsequently included in the candidate’s file at the time the file is due from the CEC to the FEC.” Disembodied voices of other faculty members suggest it is preferable to send the bylaw back to PSC. McLaren then moves to send the bylaw back to PSC and to table the bylaw until the next meeting. The motion is seconded and passes.

O’Sullivan then moves to table other bylaw changes until the next meeting, and the motion passes.

- C. FEC SLATE -- Foglesong introduces the slate and explains the faculty votes up or down on the slate of Jennifer Cavanaugh, Rick Vitray, and Kathryn Norsworthy. Sardy asks about nominees from the floor, and both Foglesong and Lauer state bylaws for FEC specify the slate comes from EC. Foglesong explains that creating the FEC slate is very difficult because of members must be full professors, and FEC also must have a gender and divisional balance. The faculty approves the slate.
- D. Internationalization Committee – Edge explains that the International Committee with EC developed names for the committee so that the membership balances various constituencies on the committee. Edge also states the committee will have ongoing members for continuity. Rock asks what this committee is because it is difficult to understand the committee and its seeming lack of transparency. J. Davison offers to nominate Rock for the committee, but Rock responds he will be on sabbatical. Gregory inquires about the workload of the committee. Edge states the committee currently works on presidential initiative grants, but the new provost could change the nature of its responsibility. Warnecke asks about the specific type of balance the committee is seeking; she believes this point requires clarification. Edge states seat 1 is foreign languages, seat 2 is those with field studies, and seat three is Holt. The ballots are collected. The meeting loses a quorum and adjourns at 1:52.

VI. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 1:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison, PhD
VP and Secretary

ATTACHMENT 1

GOVERNANCE SLATE

NOTE: Nominations will also be taken from the floor. Those nominated must be present to give their consent.

PRESIDENT: Jill Jones

VICE PRESIDENT: Dexter Boniface, Claire Strom

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (2 vacancies): Ryan Musgrave, Don Rogers, Sam Sanabria

STUDENT LIFE (3 vacancies): Daniel Crozier, Susan Montgomery, Jennifer Queen

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS (2 vacancies): Joan Davison, Robert Vander Poppen

FINANCE AND SERVICES (2 vacancies): Joe Siry

INTERNATIONALIZATION COMMITTEE

Seat 1: Nancy Decker, Alberto Prieto-Calixto

Seat 2: Yudit Greenberg, Robert Vander Poppen

Seat 3: Paul Reich, Don Rogers

ATTACHMENT 2

First-Year Field Study Courses Program Parameters

First-year field study courses are defined as short-term study abroad programs designed for first-year students and offered in:

- August, before the student begins the semester at Rollins
- January, after the first semester
- May, after the first year

Integration Across International Programs and Explorations

IP works formally with Explorations to build the pre-matriculation programs into the first-year experiences—this is particularly important in terms of summer communications, arrival on campus and initial impressions, and transition to the general on-campus orientation.

- IP will work formally and strategically with Admissions to effectively promote and market these programs to insure a good number of applicants each year.

Applicants will need to submit the following:

- 2 references—one academic and one other (coach, boss, advisor, etc.)
- A brief essay
- A resume
- An additional form with questions about past travel experience and other relevant topics

Program Parameters

First-year field study courses should aim to be sustainable programs that can be run year-to-year in order to provide continuity

First-year field study courses could include:

- International field study courses with an academic topic
- Domestic field study courses with an academic topic
- International or domestic service-learning course

First-year field study courses offered in August before the first semester at Rollins should adhere to the following:

- Faculty must complete standard training with IP as well as additional training with RCC faculty and Explorations staff during the spring semester before the field study
- A staff member will be designated as a co-leader on any new field study courses
- Courses will be offered just before the beginning of the fall semester to create a seamless transition into the full on-campus orientation
- Programs should involve no more than 10 days of travel (including travel time to and from the destination)
- Students will have a telephone conference prior to arrival on campus and a on-campus orientation program including
 - IP orientation
 - First class session
 - A welcome meal or other welcome event
- Reflection session during the fall semester—organized by IP but with involvement from other involved faculty and staff

- Pre-trip course assignments and a final assignment due post-trip
- These courses should generally be graded C/NC
- Since access to funding sources is limited, these programs should aim to be representative of the less expensive field study courses offered at Rollins—in the \$2000-\$2500 range or should identify other sources of funding to assist students

First-year field study courses should be heavily based on experiential and engaged learning.

Programs should include:

- high faculty-involvement,
- intensive scheduling with very limited unsupervised time,
- Faculty hands-on and engagement with students during the entirety of program,

Call for Proposals:

IP will put out a call for proposals for First-year field study courses each year—this will specify the specific expectations and guidelines for first-year field study courses and faculty interested in submitting a proposal will meet with staff from IP and Explorations before submitting a proposal

Timeline: 2011 and 2012

December 2010

- Submit documentation to AAC for approval of First-Year Field Study as a formal component of Explorations First-Year Programs
- Finalize proposal for 2011 First-Year program to China and submit to AAC
- Meet with Student Records staff about building the courses into the fall semester rather than the summer.
- Coordinate with Admissions to begin publicity

January 2011

- Work with Admissions on strategic publicity to applicants
- With Explorations staff:
 - Develop a training program for faculty leaders
 - Develop an integrated orientation program for the trip
 - Develop an intentional transition from the trip to the on-campus orientation

February 2011

- Put out a call for proposals for First-year field study courses in 2012: deadline April 1
- Begin once-a-month meetings with representatives from IP, Explorations and Admissions
- Work with Admissions on strategic publicity to applicants
- Develop specific application materials

March 2011

- Faculty interested in leading first-year field study in 2012 meet with Explorations and IP staff to discuss proposal ideas
- Submit 2012 programs to AAC for approval
- With Explorations Staff
 - Develop a communication plan for working with admitted student participants
- Make applications available online
- Meeting with representatives from IP, Explorations and Admissions

April—May 2011

- Review proposals, select 1-3 field study courses for 2012, and send new courses to AAC

for approval

- Recruitment of applicants for 2011
- Collect and review student applications
- Conduct faculty training for 2011 programs
- Notify accepted students
- Meeting with representatives from IP, Explorations and Admissions

June 2011

- Meeting with representatives from IP, Explorations and Admissions
- Begin pre-departure and trip arrangements
- With Explorations staff:
 - finalize plans for seamless communication and orientation

July 2011

- Phone conferences with students
- Final arrangements for trips and on-campus orientation

August 2011

- Orientation and Field Study Courses

September 2011

- Gather student evaluations and faculty/staff feedback

October 2011

- Reflection session with student participants
- Make any changes and revisions for the 2012 programs

ATTACHMENT 3A

Overview of Bylaw Changes

1. Part A, Section 2, Reappointments

Rephrase sentence from “Reappointments normally occur annually after the third appointment” to read “Reappointments normally occur annually after the **initial** appointment” to make sense.

2. Part B, Section 3, Specific Criteria, Promotion to Associate Professor

Add FEC to following sentence to accord with current practice. “If the CEC, **the FEC**, and the appropriate Dean believe that the individual's contribution to the College, professional growth, and potential warrant promotion, then upon their recommendations and the concurrence of the Provost, the promotion may be granted by the President.”

3. Part D. Post-tenure Evaluations

Change the language for post-tenure evaluation to mirror handbook language. Reiterate idea that sabbatical is for ongoing faculty development. “The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan, **which outlines the faculty member's goals, such as research, writing, performance, artistic creation, or teaching elsewhere, for her/his sabbatical. This assessment statement, with supporting documents, such as syllabi, student evaluations, and previous scholarly work,** goes to the members of the CEC to review by January 1.”

4. Part E. Procedures for Mid-course, Tenure, and Promotion, Section 1, Candidate Evaluation Committee, b. Collection of Material

Change and standardize process for collecting outside letters if required. . “**The CEC may recruit evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from experts at other institutions. The guidelines for this should be clearly stated in the department's promotion and tenure criteria. All solicited letters from outside evaluators should be forwarded to the FEC and the appropriate Dean with the CEC's letter.**”

Two points are addressed:

1. Currently candidates can request outside evaluations if they wish. This should be a departmental policy—one way or the other.
2. Currently the candidate has to request outside evaluation by June 15. According to current FEC practice, the candidate is responsible for submitting the final evaluation letters in her/his portfolio, due July 1. This does not give outside evaluators sufficient time to review candidate's materials and write letters

5. Part E. Procedures for Mid-course, Tenure, and Promotion, Section 2, Faculty Evaluation Committee, b. Composition

Change composition of FEC to address problem that committee has had the last few years with too many portfolios to review. “**When the number of candidates that the FEC must consider for tenure, promotion, or mid-course evaluation exceeds eighteen, the number of members of the committee, whenever possible, will be increased by one for every three additional candidates. Additional members of the FEC will be tenured, full**

professors, selected and ratified in the manner outlined above. They will serve as full members of the FEC for one year."

6. Part F. Appeals

Deleted appeals committee because parallel structure in All-College Bylaws and that appeals committee exists and is functioning. Having two committees that can both address appeals regarding PTE is confusing and potentially opens the college to litigation. The All-College committee language is below.

ARTICLE VI FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE

Section 1. Membership and Terms of Office

The Faculty Appeals Committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members, one from the Crummer Graduate School who shall be elected by the Crummer faculty, and two from Arts and Sciences, who shall be elected by the Arts and Sciences faculty. Committee members shall serve staggered terms of three years. Three alternates (one from the Crummer faculty and two from the Arts and Sciences faculty) shall be elected for the same terms. Members of the committee may not participate in committee deliberations or actions in cases dealing with their own individual appeals, nor may they participate in committee actions or deliberations in appeal cases in which they participated as members of an evaluation committee. Members of the committee may not participate in committee deliberations or actions in grievance cases in which they are either petitioners or named in the grievance. In such circumstances, the member shall be replaced by a corresponding alternate.

Section 2.1 Duties and Responsibilities in Appeals Cases

The committee hears the appeals of candidates for tenure and/or promotion with regard to the recommendation of the respective evaluation committee or with regard to the recommendation of the Provost. The Appeals Committee initially reviews all requests for appeal to determine sufficient cause. If the committee so determines, the case is reviewed.

Section 2.2 Recommendations in Appeals Cases

After reviewing the case, the Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the President either to uphold the original decision or to recommend a new evaluation.

Section 3. Duties and Responsibilities in Grievance Cases

If any faculty member alleges cause for grievance in any matter not covered by the procedures described in these bylaws or in pertinent AAUP policy documents, the faculty member may petition the Faculty Appeals Committee for redress. The petition will set forth in detail the nature of the grievance and will state against whom the grievance is directed. It will contain any factual data that the petitioner deems pertinent to the case. The committee will decide whether the facts merit a detailed investigation; if the faculty member succeeds in establishing a *prima facie* case, it is incumbent upon those named in the grievance to come forward with evidence in support of their position on the matter. Submission of a petition will not automatically entail investigation or detailed consideration thereof. The committee may seek to bring about a settlement of the issue that is satisfactory to the parties. If in the opinion of the committee such a settlement is not possible or appropriate, the committee will report its findings and recommendations to the petitioner and to the President or the Provost, and the petitioner will, upon request, be provided an opportunity to present the grievance to the administrator.

ATTACHMENT 3B

TEXT SHOWING BYLAW CHANGE

A. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

For joint appointments across schools, more than one Dean will be involved in the evaluation of a candidate, and so all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to "Deans" when this is the case. Likewise, in programs headed by a Director rather than a Dean, all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to a "Director." All reports and recommendations and any responses by candidates will be in writing. Recommendations regarding candidacy for tenure or promotion must clearly support or not support the candidate. Notices of reappointments and non-reappointments are the responsibility of the President and will be in writing. These letters are sent out by the Provost on behalf of the President.

Section 1. New Appointments

Faculty appointments may be made to tenure-track or visiting positions. No tenure-track appointment may last beyond seven consecutive years without the faculty being granted tenure. No visiting faculty appointment may last beyond six consecutive years. Initial appointments of tenure-track faculty shall normally be for a two-year period. All faculty appointments shall be made by the President with the advice of the Provost, who may act as the President's agent, and the appropriate Dean. All tenure-track appointments will be made as the result of national searches.

The department to which the candidate will be appointed will usually conduct the search. Search committees shall have one faculty member from outside the department who will be appointed by the appropriate Dean in consultation with the department. The appointee will be a voting member of the search committee. The recruitment and selection of candidates for faculty appointments will conform to the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies of the College.

The Dean shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department or program disapproves. If a new appointment must be made when a majority of the members of the department or program cannot be consulted, the Dean may recommend no more than a one-year visiting appointment.

While faculty members are not normally hired with tenure, this option is permitted in the special circumstance of appointment to endowed chairs. In such a case, the candidate must possess the rank of Associate or Full Professor at the previous institution and already have been granted tenure at that institution.

If the chair is in a specific discipline, a search committee will be formed within the appropriate department with representation from at least one other department appointed by the Dean of the Faculty. The committee will set out the criteria necessary for a successful candidate to the position. If the chair is not department based, the Dean will appoint a search committee consisting of representatives from relevant departments and programs.

When the search committee has reached a final decision, it will send a letter of recommendation to the FEC. The search committee and the FEC, in assessing the merit of the candidate, along with the usual evaluation of research and service, will give special consideration to teaching quality in their evaluation. The FEC will examine the credentials of the candidate and will give the Dean its approval or disapproval of the recommendation of the search committee, based on a stringent evaluation of the candidate against the tenure guidelines of the department or program.

The Dean will then pass along to the Provost his/her recommendation as well as the recommendation from the FEC. The Provost in turn will make a recommendation to the President, who then makes the final decision on the appointment.

Section 2. Reappointments

Reappointments normally occur annually after the initial appointment. However, a department or program may recommend reappointment contracts of two or three years, subject to the concurrence of the appropriate Dean. All appointments and reappointments made during a faculty member's probationary period are terminal appointments for not more than three years. Visiting appointments are for not more than three years.

Comment [CS1]: Changed to make sense.

Deleted: third

Reappointment evaluations are conducted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC). Reappointments shall be made by the President only with the approval of the CEC and a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the department, after review by the appropriate Dean and the Provost.

In the case of a renewable one-year academic year appointment, notice of non-reappointment must be transmitted in writing to the candidate not later than March 1. In case of a two-year academic appointment, a written notice of non-reappointment must be sent to the candidate not later than December 15. If a one-year appointment terminated during an academic year, the candidate must be notified in writing at least three months in advance of its termination. If a two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, the candidate must be notified in writing at least six months in advance of its termination. After two or more years of service, notice of non-reappointment must be given not later than twelve months before the expiration of the appointment.

B. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Section 1. General Criteria

The education of students is the primary mission of Rollins College. To that end the role of the faculty involves teaching, research and scholarship, and service as interrelated components that serve this mission. Rollins values teaching excellence above all. We see scholarship and service as concomitant to good teaching. We expect candidates for tenure and promotion to demonstrate scholarly interests and give evidence of an active scholarly life. We expect candidates for tenure and promotion to engage in service within the College and to demonstrate how service outside the College is connected to the mission of the College.

We expect candidates to make a case for tenure and promotion. Tenure and promotion represent a recognition by the College community that a faculty member has met Rollins' standards for membership and achievement. We expect every faculty member to adhere to professional standards, as well as to demonstrate the commitment to rational dialogue that is required for cooperative relations among colleagues and the promotion of knowledge and understanding among students. To receive tenure and promotion, the candidate must demonstrate that s/he has contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the College's educational mission and goals in spirit as well as substance. In making the case for tenure and promotion, the candidate should address the following categories:

Teaching. Rollins College expects the candidate to demonstrate both high competence in his/her field(s) and the ability to convey knowledge of her/his field to students. While we recognize the legitimacy of a wide variety of teaching methods, the candidate must be able to organize coherent and useful courses, stimulate student thought, challenge student assumptions, and establish a

realistic but demanding set of expectations. Means of evaluation in this area include course evaluations, classroom visits, review of course syllabi, writing or conversations with colleagues that demonstrate the candidate's intellectual ability, and evidence of effective communication skills. Evaluation of the quality of teaching need not be limited to on-load courses but can include student advising and over-load teaching. The candidate must demonstrate excellence as a teacher to merit tenure or promotion.

Research and Scholarship. We expect the candidate to demonstrate scholarly accomplishment, as well as ongoing intellectual activity directed toward making a contribution to his/her fields(s) and/or toward the extension or deepening of intellectual competence. We recognize the value not only of scholarship in a particular academic discipline, but also in inter-disciplinary scholarship and pedagogical research. Accomplishments in this area may be demonstrated, as appropriate, by the following: scholarly writings submitted for review by one's peers and accepted for publication, presentation of papers at professional meetings, creation of art or performance, serving as a session organizer or discussant at professional conferences, participation in scholarly activities such as seminars in which written scholarly work is required, service as a referee or reviewer for professional journals and/or publishers or professional conferences, invited lectures and performances, the receipt of grants or fellowships from which scholarly writing is expected, public performance, and the publication of journal articles or books. These activities must represent a pattern of professional development, suggesting intellectual and scholarly life that will continue after the awarding of tenure or promotion.

These requirements are the same for tenure and promotion, except that the College has higher expectations for candidates for promotion to Professor. Given the time that normally elapses before a candidate can apply for promotion to Professor, he or she must be able to demonstrate a stronger record of scholarly accomplishment to merit promotion.

College Service. We expect every faculty member to make a contribution to the College community beyond the classroom and beyond her/his research efforts. Contribution to the College community beyond the classroom should include, for example, such services as participation in College committees, involvement in student activities, effectiveness and cooperation in departmental and inter-departmental programs, active and effective participation in the cultural and intellectual life of the College, and service in the outside community. Development of academic, curricular, and other programs that enrich the life of the College can weigh heavily in considering a candidate's College service.

The commitment to advising (students, organizations, programs) can also be seriously considered in evaluating a candidate's College service. Student advising includes not only accepting a reasonable number of advisees, consistent with the candidate's other responsibilities, and making oneself available to students outside of the class on a regular basis, but also interacting with students outside of class regarding issues and interests in the courses a candidate teaches and discussing with advisees their overall academic program, course selection, and career concerns.

Service to the College can take many forms, and Rollins recognizes the variety of contributions made by individual faculty members that contribute to the mission of the College.

Section 2. Departmental Criteria

Each department, with the concurrence of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), shall determine how the above criteria shall be defined and applied for faculty evaluations in particular academic disciplines, providing to the FEC explicit standards for teaching, scholarship, and service

for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, including standards specific to the discipline. The department shall provide a rationale in support of their standards. The department must reevaluate and resubmit these criteria to the FEC every five years, or earlier if the criteria have been revised. Any department with a candidate for tenure will use the set of criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's hiring, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect. In all other cases, the set of criteria in effect three years prior to the candidate's evaluation will be used, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect.

Section 3. Specific Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

No reappointment or promotion, except as provided below for instructors who receive the terminal degree, is to be regarded as automatic, but must be earned by merit as demonstrated by all applicable activities. Promotions in rank shall be made in accord with the general criteria of the College and the specific criteria described below. They will go into effect September 1 following the evaluation proceedings.

Reappointment. Criteria for reappointment shall be the same as those for tenure and promotion, with the understanding that the candidate is evaluated for the promise of excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and College service.

Promotion to Assistant Professor. For persons employed at the initial rank of instructor pending attainment of the terminal degree, promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor will be automatic and take effect upon official confirmation of their receiving the terminal degree.

Instructors who have not received the doctorate or the terminal degree in the appropriate field may be promoted to Assistant Professor only if the majority of the CEC and the appropriate Dean conclude that all criteria for reappointment have been met and that the individual's continued employment is justified by exceptional conditions, such as: the individual's contribution to the College has been outstanding, and if applicable, progress on the terminal degree is significant enough so that this degree will be awarded within a year.

No candidate without the terminal degree will be promoted without the approval of a majority of those on the CEC.

Promotion to Associate Professor. Persons holding the rank of Assistant Professor may be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor upon and not before the award of tenure. (See eligibility for tenure, Section E.) If the CEC, the FEC, and the appropriate Dean believe that the individual's contribution to the College, professional growth, and potential warrant promotion, then upon their recommendations and the concurrence of the Provost, the promotion may be granted by the President. No candidate will be promoted without the approval of a majority of the CEC. Only in exceptional cases will promotion to the rank of Associate Professor be considered for individuals not holding the terminal degree in the appropriate field and not having completed the minimum number of years. These exceptional cases will be determined by joint approval of a majority of the relevant CEC, the FEC, and the appropriate Dean.

Comment [CS2]: Should this be added?

Promotion to Professor. Faculty members with the terminal degree in the appropriate field holding the rank of Associate Professor may be awarded promotion to Professor, after a minimum of five years full time experience in a senior institution at the rank of Associate Professor, of which at least three years have been at this institution. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation by the

President, may waive this minimum duration, but only in exceptional circumstances. The delineation of these circumstances will be determined by each CEC of the College in consultation with the FEC and the appropriate Dean.

For promotion to the rank of Professor, the individual must receive the positive recommendation of a majority of the CEC. The Provost will make a separate report and recommendation to the President. Promotions to the rank of Professor shall be made by the Board of Trustees and upon the recommendation of the President.

C. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY

The CEC (formed by December 1) will conduct annual evaluations of all tenure-track faculty. The candidate will submit materials for review, including a professional assessment statement, to the CEC by January 1. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate's permanent file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure, based on the criteria set forth in the bylaws and in individual departmental criteria.

These annual evaluations are to be conducted for every year in which neither a tenure evaluation nor a comprehensive mid-course evaluation takes place.

Departmental evaluations are to be conducted every year for Visiting Professors of any rank. The evaluation will be documented in a report and placed in the faculty member's departmental file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments in meeting department and College expectations.

D. POST-TENURE EVALUATIONS

The CEC (formed by December 1), with the support of the appropriate Dean, is charged with the responsibility of encouraging improved teaching and professional development for all members of the faculty. Tenured faculty will normally be evaluated every seven years, two years before their eligibility for a sabbatical. Exceptions may be recommended by the appropriate Dean, with the approval of the Professional Standards Committee.

While the primary purpose of continued assessment is to promote improved teaching and professional development, it also assists tenured faculty in the identification of strengths and correction of any deficiencies. Should the CEC or the appropriate Dean detect deficiencies, which are particularly significant, the evaluation proceedings may be initiated at any time.

The faculty member's professional assessment statement plays a primary role in these seven-year evaluations. The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan, which outlines the faculty members's goals, such as research, writing, performance, artistic creation, or teaching elsewhere, for her/his sabbatical. This assessment statement, with supporting documents, such as syllabi, student evaluations, and previous scholarly work, goes to the members of the CEC to review by January 1. The CEC then meets with the faculty member to discuss the professional assessment statement and writes a brief letter of evaluation in response to it, noting their developmental assessment of the faculty member and how the plans fit into the department's goals. This letter is sent to the appropriate Dean by April 15 of the penultimate year before the faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical.

Deans play a central role in providing ongoing encouragement and support for faculty efforts at professional development. The Dean meets with the faculty member separately to discuss the professional assessment statement and the letter of the CEC. The Dean then writes a brief letter

Deleted: plan

Comment [CS3]: Should we place expectations on sabbaticals? If so, what should they be?

of evaluation, stating points of concurrence or disagreement. The faculty member receives a copy of this letter by August 15 of the evaluation year.

Both letters, along with the Faculty Development Plan, are placed in a file for the faculty member that is kept in the office of the Dean. While a faculty member has a reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, this file is then used in decisions about release time, requests for funding, and merit awards.

|

Timeline for Annual and Post-tenure Review

	Annual	Post-tenure
Notification by Dean's office of eligibility	N/A	April 15
CEC formed by:	December 1	December 1
Candidate materials submitted to CEC by:	January 1	January 1
CEC's letter to Dean and candidate by:	February 15	April 15
Dean's letter to candidate and CEC by:	N/A	August 15

E. PROCEDURES FOR MID-COURSE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION FACULTY REVIEW

Section 1. Candidate Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

The chair of the department to which the candidate has been appointed, in consultation with members of that department, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee by May 15 prior to the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The CEC normally consists of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a minimum of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding tenured members who wish to serve. In addition, a member of the FEC serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member when the candidate is being evaluated for tenure or promotion. If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, non-tenured members may be appointed. If non-tenured members are unavailable, the department Chair, with the advice of the candidate and the approval of the CEC, will select tenured members from outside the department to serve on the CEC. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair. The chair of the CEC will notify the FEC, the Dean, and the candidate of the members of the CEC by June 1.

For candidates with an appointment in more than one department or program, the CEC, with the advice of the candidate, will add to the CEC one more tenured faculty member, or non-tenured faculty member if a tenured faculty member is unavailable. This faculty member should have greater familiarity with the work of the candidate outside the department to which the candidate was appointed. If such a faculty member is unavailable, the Chair of the Professional Standards Committee will select a tenured faculty member to serve on the CEC.

b. Collection of Materials Required for Review

The Chair of the CEC has the responsibility for collecting additional materials required for the evaluation including letters from tenured members of the department and/or department letters signed by the tenured members of the department, and student evaluations, and making them available electronically for members of the CEC, FEC, and the appropriate Dean to review by the time the candidate submits her/his materials.

The CEC may recruit evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from experts at other institutions. The guidelines for this should be clearly stated in the department's promotion and

Deleted: At the candidate's request, for the assessment of the candidate's scholarship, two peer evaluators for institutions other than Rollins will be selected by the Chair of the CEC and the appropriate Dean from a list submitted by the candidate. The Chair then contacts the peer evaluators and requests their evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. This request must be made in writing to both the Dean and the Chair of the CEC by June 15.

tenure criteria. All solicited letters from outside evaluators should be forwarded to the FEC and the appropriate Dean with the CEC's letter.

c. Review by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

After each member of the CEC has reviewed the candidate's file, the CEC meets with the candidate to discuss the activities addressed in the file. Issues that the CEC considered relevant to the evaluation that might not have been addressed by the candidate are also raised here. The CEC then approves a report and recommendation written by the Chair. The report and recommendation records the vote of the CEC. The report and recommendation are sent electronically to the candidate, the Dean, and the FEC.

If the CEC makes a positive recommendation, it gives reasons for its recommendation in the report. In the cases of a recommendation against awarding tenure or promotion, the CEC gives reasons for its conclusion. No candidate is tenured or promoted without the approval of a majority of the CEC. The candidate is given a copy of the report and recommendation, and has the opportunity to respond in writing, within one week, sending his/her response to all of the appropriate entities in the process.

Comment [CS4]: Right now the candidate requests such letters, but there is really not enough time to get them in his/her file, which has to be submitted by July 1. More appropriately CEC chair's job.

Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

The FEC consists of six tenured faculty members each with the rank of Professor serving staggered terms of three years. These faculty members are appointed by the Executive Committee, with some consideration given to academic diversity, and ratified by the faculty. Members of the FEC receive one course release every year they serve on the committee.

When the number of candidates that the FEC must consider for tenure, promotion, or mid-course evaluation exceeds eighteen, the number of members of the committee, whenever possible, will be increased by one for every three additional candidates. Additional members of the FEC will be tenured, full professors, selected and ratified in the manner outlined above. They will serve as full members of the FEC for one year.

Comment [CS5]: Recommended new language from FEC.

b. Access to Information

The FEC has access to the candidate's file and all other materials considered at other stages of the evaluation process, and can request additional information from the Dean. It is always appropriate for the FEC to introduce additional information that might not have been included by the CEC or the appropriate Dean. The FEC also has the authority to call in anyone it needs for consultation, especially where there is disagreement between parties at different stages of the evaluation process.

c. Review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

The FEC conducts its own evaluation of each candidate for tenure or promotion. The evaluation will be based on the following sources: the written report and recommendation by the CEC, the department's approved criteria for tenure or promotion, the assessment of external evaluators (when requested by the candidate), the report and recommendation of the appropriate Dean, the candidate's professional assessment statement, an interview with the candidate, and any other material or information that the FEC has obtained in the exercise of its duties. The FEC may also consult with the CEC, the appropriate Dean, or any other member of the community.

Meetings of the FEC must be confidential, regardless of subject matter under consideration and may be attended only by the duly appointed members of the FEC. Candidates for tenure, promotion, and mid-course reviews will attend their scheduled FEC interviews as well as additional meetings at the request of FEC. At the invitation of the FEC, other persons, who the bylaws state

may be consulted, may attend meetings of the FEC to which they are invited. This bylaw supersedes all other by laws or faculty handbook rules, which may be contrary.

The FEC cannot challenge substantive requirements of a department for tenure or promotion that has approved criteria. The FEC will require the evaluation from the CEC to adhere to its approved criteria, both procedural and substantive.

Upon completion of its review of its candidate, the FEC writes a report and recommendation. The recommendation of the FEC may agree or disagree with that of the CEC or of the Dean. In the event of a negative evaluation by the FEC, the FEC will consult with the CEC on points of disagreement. If the FEC is still not satisfied with the arguments of the CEC, it submits its negative recommendation to the Provost for his/her report and recommendation.

Section 3. Comprehensive Mid-Course Evaluation

Prior to the tenure review, each candidate for tenure and promotion will receive one comprehensive mid-course evaluation.. The CEC, the appropriate Dean, and the FEC will each prepare a written report detailing the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, including specific comments regarding directions the candidate might pursue to strengthen his or her case for tenure or promotion.

A candidate for promotion to Professor has the right to make a written request to the relevant department head and Dean for a comprehensive mid-course evaluation. The subsequent evaluation for promotion can take place no earlier than two years after the mid-course evaluation.

a. Notification

Normally, the comprehensive mid-course evaluation will take place in the spring of the candidate's third year, but no later than two years before the evaluation for tenure is to take place. The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and/or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides him/her with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials s/he must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

b. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his/her activities since her/his last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of his or her successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path

of

development, and

- how the candidate's research interests are connected to his or her academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from his or her particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional

direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, appropriate Dean, and FEC by December 15.

c. Evaluation by Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file, interviewed the candidate, and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it electronically, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by February 15. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week.

d. Evaluation by Appropriate Dean

Based on the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate, the appropriate Dean conducts a separate evaluation. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For mid-course evaluations, the Dean submits a report and recommendation to the candidate, the CEC, and FEC no less than one week before its meeting with the candidate. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week.

e. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the appropriate Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by May 15.

Section 4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

a. Eligibility

Normally, a candidate is eligible for the awarding of tenure in her/his seventh year of a tenure-track appointment at Rollins, with the possibility for earlier consideration if the candidate has had prior experience. Individuals with three years full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their sixth year at Rollins. Individuals with four or more years' full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their fifth year at Rollins. Individuals who have had full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at Rollins in a visiting position may use their Rollins' visiting experience as tenure-track, or may utilize up to the full seven-year tenure-track probationary period.

b. Notification

The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and/or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform his/her department chair and the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides her/him with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials each candidate must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

c. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his/her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development, and
- how the candidate's research interests are connected to his/her academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from her/his particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean, and FEC by July 1.

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by October 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the appropriate Dean will conduct a separate evaluation. This will be based on the Dean's review of the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For tenure decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent electronically to the FEC, the candidate, and the CEC at least one week before the candidate's meeting with FEC. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week.

f. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the appropriate Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by December 15. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the FEC, s/he may send an electronic response addressed to the Provost, but also sent to the FEC, the Dean, the CEC within one week.

It is the responsibility of the FEC to make the following materials available to the Provost by December 15: the candidate's file; the report and recommendation, together with the letters from outside evaluators, of the CEC; the report and recommendation of the Dean; the report and

recommendation of the FEC and additional materials it used in its evaluation; and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

g. Evaluation by Provost

Assessing the recommendations from the CEC, FEC, and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate's file and makes a recommendation to the President. For tenure decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by January 15. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the CEC and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the FEC, s/he submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the FEC and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the FEC and the CEC, or when the FEC receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date for the Provost's recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the FEC report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost's recommendation to the President.

h. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost's letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For tenure decision, this recommendation is made at the February Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing five business days after the meeting. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to tenure and promotion to Professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

Section 5. Promotion to Professor

a. Eligibility

Faculty members with the terminal degree in the appropriate field holding the rank of Associate Professor may be awarded promotion to Professor, after a minimum of five years full time experience in a senior institution at the rank of Associate Professor, of which at least three years have been at this institution. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation by the President, may waive this minimum duration, but only in exceptional circumstances. The delineation of these circumstances will be determined by each CEC of the College in consultation with the FEC and the Dean.

b. Notification of the Candidate

The review for promotion to Professor is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform his/her chair and the Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides her/him with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials that s/he must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

c. The Candidate

At the time of the promotion to Professor evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his or her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation

- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development, and
- how the candidate's research interests are connected to her/his academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from his/her particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean, and FEC by July 1.

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by November 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the appropriate Dean will conduct a separate evaluation. This will be based on the Dean's review of the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For promotion to Professor decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent electronically to the FEC, the candidate, and the CEC no less than one week before FEC's meeting with the candidate. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week.

f. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by April 1. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the FEC, s/he may send a response addressed to the Provost, but sent also to the FEC, the Dean and the CEC within one week.

It is the responsibility of the FEC to make the following materials available to the Provost by April 1: the candidate's file; the report and recommendation, together with the letters from outside evaluators, of the CEC; the report and recommendation of the Dean; the report and recommendation of the FEC and additional materials it used in its evaluation; and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

g. Evaluation by Provost

Assessing the recommendations from the CEC, FEC, and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate's file and makes a recommendation to the President. For promotion to Professor decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by April 15. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the CEC and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the FEC, s/he submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the FEC and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the FEC and the CEC, or when the FEC receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date

for the Provost's recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the FEC report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost's recommendation to the President.

h. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost's letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For promotion to Professor decision, this recommendation is made at the May Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing five business days after the meeting. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

Section 6. Timeline

	Mid-Course Evaluation	Tenure & Promotion	Promotion to Professor
Dean notifies Candidate re: eligibility	April 15	April 15	April 15
Candidate notifies Dean re: intention CEC formed	May 15	May 15	May 15
CEC chair notifies Dean, candidate, and FEC of CEC make up	June 1	June 1	June 1
Candidate electronically submits materials to CEC members, Dean, and FEC members	December 15	July 1	July 1
CEC submits letter to candidate, Dean, and FEC Chair	February 15	October 1	November 1
Dean submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and FEC Chair	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting
FEC submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and Dean	May 15	December 15	April 1
FEC submits letter to Provost	N/A	December 15	April 1

Comment [CS6]: Delete this whole section. This committee is not used for appeals. Appeals are heard by the Appeals Committee created by Article VI under the All-faculty bylaws. Do we want to continue this process or resurrect this committee? Shouldn't have two committees doing same job.

Deleted: F

Deleted: . APPEALS ON DECISIONS OF TENURE AND PROMOTION ¶

Section 1. Grounds ¶

Decisions on tenure and promotion may be appealed in the event of the following charges: discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age or physical handicap; procedural improprieties; or violations of academic freedom. ¶

¶

Section 2. Appointment of the Appeals Committee ¶

The Appeals Committee consists of three tenured faculty with the rank of Professor, serving staggered terms of three years. The Professional Standards Committee, upon the approval of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the President appoints these three members. The Appeals Committee will include no members of the Candidate Evaluation Committee or the Faculty Evaluation Committee.¶

¶

Section 3. Review of the Appeals Committee ¶

A candidate who appeals a tenure or promotion decision has until August 1 following the evaluation to file an appeal. The candidate appeals to the Appeals Committee who reviews the case and decides whether there is sufficient cause for an appeal. If the Appeals Committee finds that sufficient cause does exist, a meeting for a full-scale review is convened. ¶

The Appeals Committee has the authority to review the procedure of a tenure or promotion decision. It does not rule on the substance of a case. To win an appeal, the candidate must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Committee that the evaluation process has been flawed. In the absence of convincing evidence that the procedure has been flawed, the Appeals Committee affirms the original decision to deny tenure or promotion. ¶

¶

Section 4. Recommendations of the Appeals Committee ¶

After reviewing the case, the Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the President. It may recommend upholding the decision to deny tenure or promotion, or it may recommend a new evaluation, either by the original committee(s) or by newly constitu

... [1]

. APPEALS ON DECISIONS OF TENURE AND PROMOTION**Section 1. Grounds**

Decisions on tenure and promotion may be appealed in the event of the following charges: discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age or physical handicap; procedural improprieties; or violations of academic freedom.

Section 2. Appointment of the Appeals Committee

The Appeals Committee consists of three tenured faculty with the rank of Professor, serving staggered terms of three years. The Professional Standards Committee, upon the approval of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the President appoints these three members. The Appeals Committee will include no members of the Candidate Evaluation Committee or the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Section 3. Review of the Appeals Committee

A candidate who appeals a tenure or promotion decision has until August 1 following the evaluation to file an appeal. The candidate appeals to the Appeals Committee who reviews the case and decides whether there is sufficient cause for an appeal. If the Appeals Committee finds that sufficient cause does exist, a meeting for a full-scale review is convened.

The Appeals Committee has the authority to review the procedure of a tenure or promotion decision. It does not rule on the substance of a case. To win an appeal, the candidate must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Committee that the evaluation process has been flawed. In the absence of convincing evidence that the procedure has been flawed, the Appeals Committee affirms the original decision to deny tenure or promotion.

Section 4. Recommendations of the Appeals Committee

After reviewing the case, the Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the President. It may recommend upholding the decision to deny tenure or promotion, or it may recommend a new evaluation, either by the original committee(s) or by newly constituted committee(s) as appropriate.